DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 242 830 UD 023 489

AUTHOR Cruthird, J. Robert L.; Goodwin, E. Marvin
TITLE Migrant Differentials: An Examination of Social, Political, and Economic Dynamics of Life in the Receiving Area for Black Rural-Urban Migrants, 1915-1950.
PUB DATE 83
NOTE 46p.; Revised version of a paper presented at a National Endowment for the Humanities Summer Seminar (Madison, WI, 1983) and the Convention of the Association for the Study of the Life and History of Afro-Americans (Detroit MI, 1983).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Aspiration; *Black Attitudes; *Black Population Trends; *Economic Factors; Employment Opportunities; Family Income; Family Status; Life Style; *Migration; Regional Attitudes; Relocation; Social Attitudes; *Social Differences; Socioeconomic Status; Whites
IDENTIFIERS Illinois (Chicago); United States (North); United States (South)

ABSTRACT

This is a report on a study of the motives of southern blacks for migrating to the North during the period 1915-50. In particular, the study examined whether attitudes that existed as a result of sentimental (rather than solely economic) factors involved in movement from the South encouraged an orientation toward the northern opportunity structure for certain status-levels of migrants. The data were drawn from approximately 500 case studies of elderly black residents of Chicago obtained over a three year period. After a review of the literature and an analysis of the "push-pull" model usually applied to black internal migration, the researchers divided a sample of 108 respondents in the case studies into lower, middle and upper status levels based on their family background, educational level, and style of life. The status levels were then related to the respondents' reported attitudes about relations between blacks and whites in the South, and their perceptions of opportunities in the North. Results of this correlation were somewhat inconclusive due to the small number of respondents classified as middle or upper status, but seemed to indicate that blacks at the lower status level migrated primarily for economic reasons, while blacks at the middle and upper status levels frequently had other motives, including socioemotional concerns, for relocating. (CJM)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

reddy-13-84

ED242830

# Migrant Differentials: An Examination of Social, Political, and Economic Dynamics of Life in the Receiving Area for Black Rural-Urban Migrants, 1915-1950

J. Robert L. Cruthird
Kennedy-King College, Chicago

E. Marvin Goodwin
Kennedy-King College, Chicago

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
J. Robert L. Cruthird

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Direct all correspondence to: J. Robert L. Cruthird, Social Science Department, Dennedy-King College, Chicago, Illinois 60621.

This research is a joint effort and part of a larger project. The order of the authors' names will be alternated on subsequent reports produced by this joint effort. An earlier version of this paper was presented at a National Endowment for the Humanities Summer Seminar (1983) at the University of Wisconsin--Madison and the 1983 Convention of the Association for the Study of the Life and History of Afro-Americans in Detroit, Michigan.

UD023489

## Introduction

The migration of Afro-Americans from the southern United States to northern regions has received a variety of scholarly treatments. A basic assumption of much of this work has been that socioeconomic factors influenced by specific historical events resulted in the movement of southern blacks to the North. Essentially, intermittent periods of extreme violence and intimidation stimulated the northern migration of blacks while economic opportunities in the northern regions directed their course. The interactive forces encouraging or retarding the outmigration of southern blacks are well documented in the literature. Pinkney (1975:27-36) has reviewed the more salient of these: Compromise of 1877, Hayes' defeat of Tilden, the alleged end of reconstruction; the so-called Atlanta Compromise speech of 1895, suggesting that blacks remain in the South; the founding in 1909 of the NAACP, which called for enforcement of the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments to the Constitution; outbreak of World War I, need for labor in northern industries; the Garvey Movement during the 1920s; the Great Depression which slowed if not halted migration of blacks to the North; New Deal government with proposals to end discrimination in employment; rise of industrial unionism; outbreak of World War II, need for labor in northern industries. Southern Whites responded with various levels of intolerance for black citizenry upon manumission from physical violence in the form of lynchings, whippings, burnings, and the like, to less physical forms of socioeconomic and political subordination and exclusion from freedom of social action (Davis, 1941; Dollard, 1937; Powdermaker, 1939; Johnson, 1941; Dubois, 1903, 1935; Franklin, 1948). Although many studies reveal that violence and intimidation in the South may have motivated the departure of blacks, the denial of freedom of social action was not exclusive to the South (Lyman, 1972; Myrdal, 1944).

Indeed, scholars of black internal migration are rather consistent in the view that, in many respects, northern intolerance of freedom of social action of

blacks equalled that in the South. On the whole, northern intolerance ran the gamut from the outright defense of the southern social structure and its doctrine of white supremacy in magazines and newspapers to direct physical violence similar in form to that practiced in the South. Patterns of northern violence against blacks are well documented: East St. Louis, 1917, 125 blacks massacred and burned; Tennessee, 3000 white spectators responded to a white newspaper invitation to watch a black man burned alive; 1919, fourteen blacks publicly burned in various cities; 1919, seventy blacks including ten servicemen lynched; 1919, Chicago, thirty-eight persons killed, twenty-three blacks--Chicago, main northern port-of-entry for Negro migrants from the central South, experienced the worst of these anti-Negro riots, a week of killing and maiming and burning in the summer of 1919 (Chicago Commission on Race Relations, 1968). But it was Pinkney (1975:26-7) who claimed, "From 1877 to 1954 virtually all events pertaining to black people in the United States adversely affected their status."

Actual data on the migration of southern blacks to northern regions have been adequately surveyed and reported as well. Of a reported 8,883,994 blacks in the United States in 1900, 911,025 or nearly ten percent lived in the North. A reported 366,880 blacks migrated to northern states between 1900-1910. Various estimates place the number of blacks migrating from southern to northern states during 1910-1920 at between 500,000 to 1,000,000 (Chicago Commission on Race Relations, 1968; Pinkney, 1975). In addition, Davis and Donaldson (1975) observed that while the "great migration" of 1915 marked a significant change in the distribution of blacks in the United States, the outmigration of blacks from the South actually continued well into the second-half of the century. "The proportion of the black population living in the South declined from 68 percent in 1950 to 53 percent in 1970. Migration to the North has often depopulated small black hamlets in the South" (Davis and Donaldson, 1975:32). Slightly less than one-half (48 percent) of America's 26 million blacks live in the North.

Observers of outmigration of blacks from southern states have identified three major migratory streams. The first pattern was from the Carolinas, Georgia, and Florida to locations such as Washington, D.C., Philadelphia, New York, and Boston. A second pattern was from Mississippi, Arkansas, and part of Alabama to St. Louis, Detroit, Chicago, and Milwaukee. The third was from Texas and parts of Louisiana to Los Angeles and the West Coast. A point of commonality between migratory streams is that southern blacks, rural and urban, tended to migrate to large cities in northern and western states during the period considered in this paper, 1915-1950 (cf Davis and Donaldson, 1975:32).

The "great migration" and subsequent but less dramatic flows affected northern urban centers both demographically and socially. It has been asserted that as a result of the great migration, Chicago as of the 1970s housed more black Americans than all of Mississippi, and the New York metropolitan area had more black Americans than any state of the old south (cf Pettigrew, 1971, in Palen, 1981). Recent data from the 1980 census of population reveal that black people comprise the largest single group in the City of Chicago, 39.8 percent of a total population of 2,986,430, and the second largest group on the Chicago Metropolitan area, 20.1 percent of the population (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1980; U.S. News and World Report, 1981). The social implications of this engrossing revelation are equally provocative. For example, Baron (1968) noted that as late as 196[illegible], black Americans on the whole had been excluded from major institutional sources of power in the Chicago, Cook County, Illinois, social structure. When receiving the 1965 findings in 1974, Baron concluded that blacks were hardly nearer the command posts of power than they were in 1965. More recently, Rich (1982) observed that blacks as a group have progressed slowly in socioeconomic and political power over the past twenty years. These conclusions predate recent transformations in Chicago politics. The 1983 local elections of the City of Chicago resulted in a mayor and other municipal representatives of Afro-American

ethnic derivation. It is not clear whether new patterns will prevail after examination of the post-1983 era of Chicago's history.

Push-Pull Model

In the past, observers of black internal migration have made extensive use of the push-pull model in efforts to explain this event. This approach is still in vogue today. Under this model, outmigration of southern blacks to northern regions resulted from some combination of economic, social, and political conditions. Simply put, violence, intimidation and legal and extra-legal repression led to a gross distrust of the southern social structure by blacks. The circumstances of racism and intolerance of whites along with the continued mechanization of agriculture, as well as other historical events, tended to stimulate outward movement. The "pull" of northern industrial jobs is thought to complete the model.
A particularly useful work is Davis and Donaldson (1975:53-91), which describes in explicit detail the push-pull model of southern to northern migration of Black Americans and present an extensive treatment of its constituent factors or conditions. The major categories of the model are set down in topical form: Economic "push" factors--mechanization of agriculture, natural disasters such as the destruction by the boll weevil and floods, reduction of cotton acreage, mismanagement and or maladministration of agricultrual programs; Social "push" factors--precariousness of the southern justice system, lynching and terrorism, economic servitude under the fee and convict lease system, low employment opportunities, insufficient educational opportunities, inadequate health care, denial of the franchise; and Socioeconomic "pull" factors in the North--expansion of industry, transportation, communication; immigration laws; lesser attachment to the land by southern blacks; encouragement from family, friends, and newspapers in the North; employment opportunities. These authors argued that racism was an integral part of all constituent factors of the push-pull model and employed this element in subsequent discussions.

Although the push-pull model for explaining southern to northern migration of blacks remains attractive and useful, it is insufficient as a total explanation without some further, important considerations. The language commonly used under this model has not promoted conceptual clarity about black internal migration. An inherent weakness of the model is its relatively low predictive capacity. On closer examination, it appears better able to order and classify migrants after the fact of migration than predict migration with any consistency. Because of this deficiency explanations of black internal migration have lacked the degree of precision often desired. Another problem with the model is its tendency to over homogenize the interests and concerns of different migrants. From this position it would seem that most if not all migrants were moved by the same causal factors. However, this does not mesh harmoniously with the historical record (Spear, 1971; Levine, 1977).

A curious fact is that many of those following the push-pull model to explain black internal migration have indicated in their writings a recognition of various patterns of differentiation within the ranks of southern black migrants, but have granted this important fact little more than casual attention. On the whole, followers of the push-pull model tend to quickly abandon the historical record and lean toward economic causation when explaining the outmigration of southern blacks to northern regions. The results are imprecision and oversimplification in this important area of Afro-American historiography. The push-pull model for explaining black internal migration requires some rethinking and modification.

Sentiment, Status Distinctions, and Focal Concerns

To this point, our working position has been that the push-pull model of black internal migration is not wholly satisfactory in its basic form. The greater tendency of this conventional approach has been to rely on an interplay of sociostructural factors, under specter of economic rationale, to explain the outmigration of southern blacks to northern regions. Socioemotional factors and their relevance for explaining

the movement of a large number of people are given much less attention. Specifically, the conventional scheme has tended to minimize the effects of sentiments behind the movement of southern blacks away from the South. This raises the important issue of the role of sentiment in the migration.

Claims that economic motives have been overstressed when attempting to explain black outmigration from the South have received some attention in the literature (cf Jones, in Levine, 1977:267). These observers argued that the tendency to over-emphasize economic motivation has quietened many who would otherwise have gone beyond the conventional framework in attempting to understand the meaning of the movement of Afro-Americans from the South. Levine (1977:264) has suggested that Afro-Americans were "...seen once again not as actors capable of affecting at least some part of their destinies, but primarily as beings who are acted upon--Southern leaves blown North by the winds of destitution."

The feelings of southern blacks about moral and legal injustice, economic exploitation, domination, and servitude before and especially after manumission have been documented in stark detail (see Levine, 1977:ch. 4). Following Levine (1977:265), the historical has revealed that large numbers of southern blacks actually decided to leave because of a complex of motives, not because they had no economic alternatives. In fact, migration was perceived as an alternative to the intolerance of whites and denial of freedom of social action in the South in general. Spear (1971:178) alluded to this point when discussing black internal migration after 1915. He asserted, "...here then was a self-conscious, independent racial movement." It would appear that migrants, on the whole, were as interested in renegotiating their life situations as in acquiring better jobs. In our view, motives, directed at renegotiating the terms of one's life situation are attached to the emotional concerns of individuals. We recognize, however, that behind individual emotional concerns lie common historical experiences and common grievances (Spear, 1971).

When investigating the causes and consequences of the Chicago Riot of 1919, the Chicago Commission on Race Relations noted that frequently sentimental causes for leaving the South took prominence over economic causes for migrants to Chicago. The Commission went on to note that this situation was especially so for "fairly high-class" black migrants. However, the Commission did not attempt a thorough, systematic analysis of the impact of sentiment on the movement of black migrants to that city. Nevertheless, two important questions had been raised. On the one hand, how important was sentiment in the decisions of migrants to leave the South for the City of Chicago? On the other hand, whether sentiment operated differently for different status-levels of migrants. (See the Chicago Commission on Race Relations, 1968.)

The question of status distinctions between southern blacks and the possible impact such differentiation may have had on their emotional concerns about leaving the South has not been well researched. The literature is more complete, however, in documenting status-levels that prevailed within the southern black population (see Pinkney, 1975). Some studies have argued that the focal concerns of blacks were influenced by attempts to distinguish themselves from others, most often with conventional social-class criteria utilized by white Americans (see Dollard, 1937; Johnson, 1941; Davis, 1941; Drake and Cayton, 1945; Frazier, 1957a, 1957b; Cruden, 1971). Moreover, Davis (1941) suggested that some southern blacks saw class as defining their position in the southern social structure, while others viewed caste (color) as the more salient identity determining their circumstances. Wilson (1959) in another context argued that members of different socioeconomic strata adhere to different values which reinforce their respective statuses. Pinkney (1975) reviewed studies of status distinctions among blacks and reported that regional differences in stratification among urban blacks did exist but maintained that, in general, the class distinctions held in the South and elsewhere. Despite these studies, research on black internal migration has not paid sufficient attention to status

distinctions within the black substrata of the American color caste-class system. Also, insufficient attention has been paid to whether sentiment operates in distinct ways for different status-levels of black migrants with respect to the rationale, motivation, and causation of movement from the South to the North. This important area of research has been relatively neglected.

The overall purpose here is to assess the usefulness of sentiment in understanding the meaning of movement of southern blacks to northern urban centers. A general concern of the research is how sentiment may have influenced the perceptions of migrants of the social structure of the City of Chicago and socioeconomic and political opportunities available in the new milieu. In particular, the paper examines whether attitudes that existed as a result of sentimental factors involved in movement from the South encouraged a generalized orientation toward the northern opportunity structure for certain status-levels of migrants. We do not claim that sentimental factors can be clearly separated from economic factors with respect to black internal migration (see Bobo, 1974). Our intent is to uncover the different focal concerns of migrants from different status-levels in order to assess whether these concerns influenced their decisions to migrate and their expectations about the opportunity structure of the City of Chicago. To the extent this can be accomplished, we shall form a more complete version of the push-pull model.

Life Chances and Quality of Life

This paper considers several variables that may have differed in different status groups. First is the concept of "life chances," that is, education for oneself and one's family, a safe living environment, the availability of work, the ability to remain healthy or acquire adequate medical care when ill, and to live a normal life span. As such, life chances related to but were not dependent exclusively on economic factors for southern blacks. An individual's perception of his or her life chances may have related more directly to beliefs about the ability to control the circumstances of life and remain free of the negative effects

of dominant group beliefs and prerogatives operative in the southern social structure. Historically, the dominant group has been protective of its claims to certain areas of privilege and advantage. Smith (1981) noted that such claims were often viewed as proprietary in character. It would appear that reactions of white southerners to perceived threats to their prerogatives would have a negative affect on intergroup relations as well as the attitudes of black southerners about the quality of life possible in the South. In our view, this would contribute to raised perceptions of possibilities of better life chances in the North. Movement to northern urban centers such as Chicago may have, in part, been influenced by doubts of black southerners about the possibility of achieving first-class citizenship in the South (Pinkney, 1975). It has not been shown that the perceptions of black migrants of the opportunity structure of northern cities such as Chicago were in any way consistent with the objective reality that awaited them.

Whatever the "push" factors, not all blacks migrated northward. Davis (1941:57) claimed that blacks who accepted and abided by the caste system could achieve a high degree of security in his relations to whites in the South. Then, too, it has been observed that within the group of northern migrants different attitudes prevailed as to what might consitiute life chances or well-being in the receiving area (Chicago Commission on Race Relations, 1968). The different choices may well have been linked to attitudes and perceptions about the quality of life in the South emerging from the experiences of individuals, and these are primarily sentimental in character. Thus, we submit that migrants were not undifferentiated to begin with in their parent regions (see Pinkney, 1975:67; Drake, 1971). Also, perceptions of the quality of life led in the South may have been influenced by status-levels among potential migrants, as well as by the general group position of black southerners relative to white southerners in the social order (Davis, 1941:49-50; Smith, 1981). The focal concerns of black migrants leaving the South may have been tempered by both their status among blacks and their perceptions of black-white relations in the South. This general hypothesis guides our inquiry.

Hypotheses

The following hypotheses for research directed the approach to solving the main problem:

Hypothesis 1: Perceptions of the opportunity structures of the South and North will depend upon patterns of sentiment associated with status ranks that prevailed among southern black migrants.

Hypothesis 2: The focal concerns of southern black migrants from different status-levels will influence the types of opportunities they desired in the opportunity structure of Chicago.

This investigation focuses on beliefs of black migrants to Chicago from the South between 1915 and 1950. We intend to uncover sentiments about their lives in the South, perceptions of the opportunity structures of the places from which they departed, and perceptions of the opportunity structure of the City of Chicago. The study makes no attempt to examine distinctions between belief systems of migrants relative to nonmigrants. Furthermore, no attempt will be made to distinguish between migrants on the basis on rural or urban origins. Finally, the study is not concerned with whatever disparities existed between subjectively held sentiments and the objective reality in respect to openess or closeness of the opportunity structure of the City of Chicago. While such matters are important, they lie beyond the scope of this investigation. Nevertheless, our results may have important implications for these concerns.

## Data and Method

The data upon which this research is based were extracted from approximately 500 case studies of elderly black residents of the City of Chicago who migrated to the city from the South during 1915 - 1950. The case studies were obtained as an assignment for students enrolled in Afro-American History and second semester social science courses over a three-year period. In addition, some case studies were obtained by faculty colleagues of the Social Science Department who expressed an interest in the project.

The oral history method was employed exclusively in the data collection process. In general, respondents were chosen on the basis of their movement from the South to Chicago during the time period established. As much as possible, respondents were allowed to tell their own stories from memories they had of their own lives with respect to events and circumstances surrounding their leaving the South. This method of data collection has been useful when reviewing, recovering, and reporting important information about past life experiences and situations of particular groups that have not adhered strictly to a written tradition. Oral history procedures have been recognized as being particularly suited for collecting the information of the type needed to write social histories of events and occurrences in the lives of Afro-Americans (Hoffman, 1974).

In addition, we thought a sociohistorical frame-of-reference would be useful in approaching the overall aims of this research. A common justification for use of this perspective is that it assumes a "history from the bottom up approach," a concern with the experiences of ordinary people rather than a direct concern with the elite members of a particular group (Levine, 1977:x/preface; Henretta, 1979: Stearns, 1980). But it was Stearns (1980:213) who asserted that the "history from the bottom up approach" has defined the sociohistorical component of investigations in Afro-American History. Moreover, Levine (1977) indicated that this approach may be a viable methodology for inquiry into certain areas of Afro-American culture and history which otherwise may be unaccessible. Indeed, the sociohistorical framework is very compatible with the procedures utilized in the collection of data. In our view, it may be possible to gain greater precision of interpretation of the meaning of black internal migration by approaching this event from the perspective of the "masses" that actually participated (see Lyman, 1972:25; Henretta, 1979:1315-22).

Oral histories were taken down on written notes, interview schedules, and with tape recorders. Interviewers were charged with identifying respondents and arranging a convenient time to conduct the interview. Respondents were identified

through a variety of techniques, such as, friends, peers, prior acquaintanceships, family members referrals, and the like. Interviewers requested information about the economic, demographic, and social characteristics of respondents' conjugal family, natal family, and maternal and paternal grandparents. Also, general information was requested of each respondent about his or her life situation in the South, beliefs, attitudes, feelings, aspirations, and grievances.

Probability sampling techniques were not utilized in this study. Essentially, information was provided by solicited respondents who made themselves available for study. The decision to employ availability sampling as an alternative to probability sampling procedures was based on pragmatic considerations rather than preference. The economy of time, effort, and resources required that we make use of available opportunities when selecting respondents for study, althouth fully aware of the limitations of this procedure (Mueller, et al., 1970:350-51). Tabular analysis was the procedure used to manage the data in this report. A major limitation of the investigation was the relatively small number of cases that actually qualified for inclusion in the study. Therefore, all findings should be regarded with due caution.

The Sample

The sample (N=108) upon which this investigation is based consisted of male and female respondents who left areas of the South for the City of Chicago during 1915 - 1950. All respondents were between the ages of 18 and 65 at the time of arrival in Chicago, economically productive ages by conventional demographic standards. In general, respondents were from Mississippi, Alabama, and Arkansas. However, the greater propotion of the sample was from the State of Mississippi. Accurate income data on respondents at the time of arrival was unavailable. These data indicate that income on the whole was quite low. It was found that the greater proportion of the sample consisted of individuals who held occupations such as domestic worker, tenant farmer, farm hand, laborer, and other lesser skilled

occupations while in the South. Education varied from no education to college graduate. Fifty-six percent of respondents had a grade school education or less, 35 percent had some high school or had completed high school, and 9 percent had some college or had completed college. The sex division was not grossly uneven, 54 percent females and 46 percent males. The overwhelming proportion of respondents were presently or had been married at the time of arrival, actually 78 percent were in this category. Moreover, better than three-fourths of respondents were below thirty-six years of age at the time of arrival in Chicago, while slightly more than 58 percent were thirty years of age or below. In fact, close to forty-one percent of respondents were below twenty-six years of age at the time of arrival (see Table 1).

Status Distinctions/Status Rank

Our first task was to identify items on the oral history interview schedule which reflected status rank of our respondents. When this was accomplished, it would then be possible to delineate distinct status-levels. Only then would it be possible to examine how delineated status-levels perceived the opportunity structures of the South and Chicago. In pursuit of this initial aim, we took direction from Pinkney (1975) on inequality in the black community and the problems inherent in the use of objective social-class criteria for evaluating status among members.

Table 1 Profile of Migrants to Chicago from the South During 1915 - 1950.
Data from Oral History Interviews, Case Studies, N = 108.

(% in Parentheses)

| | Sex | | Marital Status at Arrival | | Highest Education Level at Time of Interview | | | | | Occupation at Time of Interview or Last | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Male | Female | Married or had been | Never Married | Grade School or Less | Some High School | High Sch Grad | Some Coll | Coll Grad | Profes Prop Teach | Minister | Clerk | Skill Crft/ Labor | Farm Domest Labor Shcrop |
| Total | 50 (46) | 58 (54) | 83 (78) | 24 (22) | 60 (56) | 20 (18) | 18 (17) | 8 (7) | 2 (2) | 5 (4) | 1 (1) | 11 (11) | 17 (16) | 70 (67) |
| | N = 108 | | N = 107 Miss = 1 | | N = 108 | | | | | N = 104 Miss = 4 | | | | |
| Age | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18 - 25 | 23 (46) | 21 (36) | 25 (30) | 18 (75) | 21 (35) | 8 (40) | 11 (61) | 4 (50) | -- | 2 (40) | -- | 5 (45) | 7 (41) | 27 (37) |
| 26 - 30 | 8 (16) | 11 (19) | 16 (19) | 3 (12) | 12 (20) | 1 (5) | 3 (17) | 2 (25) | -- | -- | -- | 3 (27) | 3 (18) | 12 (17) |
| 31 - 35 | 11 (22) | 10 (17) | 19 (23) | 2 (8) | 13 (22) | 5 (25) | 2 (11) | -- | 1 (50) | 1 (20) | -- | 2 (18) | 4 (23) | 14 (20) |
| 36 - 40 | 5 (10) | 9 (15) | 14 (17) | [illegible] | 9 (15) | 3 (15) | 2 (11) | 1 (12) | -- | 2 (40) | -- | -- | 3 (18) | 10 (14) |
| 41 - 45 | 1 (2) | 5 (9) | 5 (6) | 1 (4) | 5 (8) | -- | -- | -- | 1 (50) | -- | -- | 1 (9) | -- | 4 (6) |
| 46 - 50 | 1 (2) | 1 (2) | 2 (2) | -- | -- | 1 (5) | -- | 1 (12) | -- | -- | 1 (100) | -- | -- | 1 (1) |
| 51 - Over | 1 (2) | 1 (2) | 2 (2) | -- | -- | 2 (10) | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 2 (3) |

He writes:

> Because of the overrepresentation of blacks in the lower class, stratification tends to be based to a greater degree on behavioral patterns and social factors rather than on income and occupation which usually are considered crucial determinants in the white community. Social stratification in the black community is more likely to be determined by style of life and family background. Although a few blacks who have amassed great wealth or achieved fame in the larger society might be considered upper class by objective standards, most blacks who are considered upper class within their own community would not be so considered if they were white. School teachers are a notable example; within the black community they are frequently considered to be upper class; white school teachers are rarely so considered. Similarly, many individuals working as skilled workers, service workers, and even laborers are considered to be middle class because of their behavior patterns.

The tendency of Black Americans to emphasize behavioral rather than objective criteria to confer differential status was especially so for the time period established for this investigation. While behavioral criteria for assigning status may have been given greater emphasis, objective criteria was also used as well as a range of other factors. Pinkney's review of community studies of social stratification in the black community revealed the following patterns: (1) Johnson (1941) delineated three classes and estimated the upper, middle, and lower classes to comprise 6 percent, 12 percent, and 82 percent of the population, respectively. The upper class consisted of those with a known and respected family social heritage and high education and occupational status, such as, doctors, school teachers, and successful landowners. Proprietors of small businesses, white-collar workers, school teachers, and some skilled artisans made up the middle class. The lower class consisted of unskilled and semiskilled workers, domestic workers, sharecroppers and tenant farmers; (2) Dollard (1937) noted the presence of three classes. He reported that the middle class was composed mainly of teachers and ministers, while the lower class was made up of individuals with the lowest skill levels; (3) Drake and Cayton (1945) reported that the upper class included medical doctors, lawyers, newspaper editors, civic leaders, and politicians.

But the prestige of this group was based primarily on education, professional status and style of life rather than income. The middle class consisted of professionals, independent businessmen, clerical workers, service workers, and laborers. Again, style of life was the major element that distinguished this strata from the one below it.

Pinkney (1975) was generally followed to delineate differential statuses among our respondents. Because of our general sociohistorical approach, we did not impose a rigorous operational definition on the concept of status-level. Our focus was on the emotional concerns of individual migrants and the phenomenological essence of their responses to inquires about their experiences with regard to out-migration from the South (Henretta, 1979).

The Oral History Interview Schedule contained a variety of questions which provided fairly good information that could be used to derive status rank. The specific questions were as follows:

(1) Highest educational level attained by each family member?

(2) Occupation of each parent?

(3) Occupation of maternal and paternal grandparents?

(4) To what organizations other than religious or political did your family belong?

(5) Did you have much contact with whites (IN THE SOUTH)? In what ways?

(6) Who were the rich folk, black or white, when you were growing up? (FAMILY WEALTHY OR NOT? SOURCE OF WEALTH?)

Questions 1, 2, and 3 were considered as indicating the family background of respondents. Questions 4, 5, and 6 were broad and open-ended. The responses were recorded in detail for later office coding. The categories employed subsequently reflected lifestyle and behavioral dimensions of individual responses. Information from these two sets of questions was drawn together to form a composite picture of status rank for each case. Finally, respondents were grouped into status-levels

on the basis of criteria identified in the community studies reviewed above and impressions gained from a careful consideration of all information contained in each case study-file. Table 2 reports familial status of respondents' families by time of arrival in Chicago for the sample.

Table 2 Familial Status of Respondents' Families by Time of Arrival, Black Migrants to Chicago, 1915 - 1950, N = 108

(% in Parentheses)

| Time of Arrival | Familial Status: Lower | Middle | Upper |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1915 - 1924 | 12 (14) | 1 (8) | 2 (25) |
| 1925 - 1934 | 17 (19) | 3 (25) | 1 (12) |
| 1935 - 1944 | 42 (48) | 6 (50) | 2 (25) |
| 1945 - 1950 | 16 (18) | 2 (17) | 3 (38) |
| Not Available | 1 (1) | -- | -- |
| Total (N = 108) | 88 (82) | 12 (11) | 8 (7) |

It can be seen in Table 2 that 82 percent of our respondents were of lower familial status, 11 percent were identified with the middle familial status, and 7 percent were of upper familial status, based on the procedures we used to make these classifications. Contrasts between familial status-levels across dimensions of stratification reflected in the series of questions are shown in Table 3.

Table 3 Distribution of Family Background and Style of Life Factors by Status Level, Black Migrants to Chicago, 1915 - 1950

(% in Parentheses)

| Dimensions of Stratification | Familial Status | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Lower | Middle | Upper |
| **Highest Educational Level of Family Members** | | | |
| Fathers' education | | | |
| Some college or more | -- | -- | -- |
| High school graduate | -- | 1 (8) | -- |
| Some high school | -- | -- | -- |
| Grade school or less | 7 (8) | 3 (25) | -- |
| Not available | 81 (92) | 8 (67) | 8 (100) |
| Mothers' education | | | |
| Some college or more | -- | -- | -- |
| High school graduate | -- | -- | -- |
| Some high school | -- | 1 (8) | -- |
| Grade school or less | 7 (8) | 3 (25) | -- |
| Not available | 81 (92) | 8 (67) | 8 (100) |
| Sibling's education | | | |
| Some college or more | 13 (15) | 1 (8) | 4 (50) |
| High school graduate | 10 (11) | 3 (25) | 1 (12) |
| Some high school | 7 (8) | 2 (17) | -- |
| Grade school or less | 29 (33) | 5 (42) | 1 (12) |
| Not available | 29 (33) | 1 (8) | 2 (25) |

Table 3 (cont.) Family Background and Style of Life

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Occupation of Parents** | | | |
| Fathers' occupation | | | |
| Professional, landowner, teacher | -- | -- | 7 (88) |
| Minister, clerical, skilled worker | 1 (1) | 9 (75) | 1 (12) |
| Manual and other | 83 (94) | 2 (17) | -- |
| Not available | 4 (4) | 1 (8) | -- |
| Mothers' occupation | | | |
| Professional, landowner, teacher | -- | 3 (25) | 2 (25) |
| Minister, clerical, skilled worker | 1 (1) | 1 (8) | 2 (25) |
| Manual and other | 83 (94) | 7 (58) | 4 (50) |
| Not available | 4 (4) | 1 (8) | -- |
| **Occupation of Grandparents** | | | |
| Maternal grandfather | | | |
| Professional, landowner, teacher | 1 (1) | -- | 1 (12) |
| Minister, clerical, skilled worker | 4 (4) | 1 (8) | -- |
| Manual and other | 35 (40) | 2 (17) | 1 (12) |
| Not available | 48 (55) | 9 (75) | 6 (75) |
| Maternal grandmother | | | |
| Professional, landowner, teacher | 1 (1) | -- | 1 (12) |
| Minister, clerical, skilled worker | 1 (1) | -- | -- |
| Manual and other | 45 (51) | 4 (33) | 2 (25) |
| Not available | 41 (46) | 8 (67) | 5 (63) |
| Paternal grandfather | | | |
| Professional, landowner, teacher | -- | 1 (8) | 1 (12) |
| Minister, clerical, skilled worker | 1 (1) | 2 (17) | -- |
| Manual and other | 32 (36) | 2 (17) | 2 (25) |
| Not available | 55 (62) | 7 (58) | 5 (63) |

Table 3 (cont.) Family Background and Style of Life

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Paternal grandmother | | | |
| Professional, landowner, teacher | 1 (1) | -- | -- |
| Minister, clerical, skilled worker | -- | -- | -- |
| Manual and other | 27 (31) | 1 (8) | 3 (38) |
| Not available | 60 (68) | 11 (92) | 5 (62) |
| **Nonreligious/Nonpolitical Organizations of Family Members** | | | |
| Fathers' | | | |
| Fraternal | 15 (17) | 2 (17) | 2 (25) |
| Social clubs and others | -- | -- | -- |
| None | 58 (66) | 8 (66) | 6 (75) |
| Not available | 15 (17) | 2 (17) | -- |
| Mothers' | | | |
| Fraternal | 9 (10) | 1 (8) | 1 (12) |
| Social clubs and others | -- | -- | -- |
| None | 66 (75) | 7 (58) | 7 (88) |
| Not available | 13 (15) | 4 (33) | -- |
| Siblings' | | | |
| Fraternal | 13 (15) | 2 (17) | 1 (12) |
| Social clubs and others | 3 (3) | 1 (8) | 1 (12) |
| None | 59 (67) | 6 (50) | 6 (75) |
| Not available | 13 (15) | 3 (25) | -- |

Table 3 (cont.) Family Background and Style of Life

| Respondents' Contact with Whites in the South--In What Ways? Area of Contact | Amount of Contact | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Politics and Business | Quite a bit | -- | -- | -- |
| | Some | -- | -- | 1 (12) |
| Worked for or with and School/Neighbor | Quite a bit | 29 (33) | 4 (33) | 1 (12) |
| | Some | 21 (24) | 4 (33) | 1 (12) |
| Social and Interpersonal | Quite a bit | 4 (4) | -- | 1 (12) |
| | Some | 5 (6) | -- | -- |
| None | | 26 (30) | 4 (33) | 4 (50) |
| Not available | | 3 (3) | -- | -- |

| Rich Black or White When Growing Up? (Family considered wealthy or not?) (Source of Wealth?) | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Wealthy or not | | | |
| Yes | | | |
| Farming | -- | 1 (8) | 1 (12) |
| Wage or salary | -- | -- | 2 (25) |
| No | 80 (91) | 9 (75) | 2 (2) |
| Not available | 8 (9) | 2 (17) | 3 (38) |

## Results

The analyses we now present were directed at uncovering the focal concerns of migrants and the effects these concerns may have had on the types of opportunities desired by the different status levels in the City of Chicago.

### Perceptions on the Opportunity Structures of the South and Chicago

Our research aim here was to reveal similarities and differences in the extent to which migrants of different status-levels believed normative tenets of the social structures of the South and Chicago would accomodate their aspirations for life chances. An important concern was how migrants viewed their life situations while in the South against the possibility to acquire their fair share of the general distribution of social rewards, such as, education, work, safety, health, wealth, and income, and so forth. Attendant to this concern was whether migrants believed their life situations could be significantly altered in Chicago if they so desired.

A series of free response questions were used to review the life situations of respondents. The specific questions were as follows:

(1) Where you lived in the South, what were the general relationships between Blacks and Whites?

(2) What were you taught, by your parents or in school, were the most important things in life?

(3) What do you consider the most important things in life?

(4) How did people make a living (where you were in the South)?

(5) Who were the rich folk, Black or White when you were growing-up?

(6) What were the reasons you or your parents/grandparents left the South?

Situational contingency relationships were constructed for responses to questions 1, 4, and 5. The analyses were designed to uncover sentiments about the quality of life led while in the South. Variations in perceptions of the general

relationships between Blacks and Whites in the South were examined for each status level while controlling for (1) migrants beliefs about the occupational characteristics of the southern community they departed and (2) migrants beliefs about the distribution of wealth across racial lines when they were growing-up in the South. The analyses are reported in tables 4 and 5.

It was found that beliefs about general relationships between Blacks and Whites in the South differed slightly by status-level. The lower the status-level of respondents' family the more likely they were to report relationship were not good. The computed Gamma = .17 between familial status and general relations between blacks and whites (see Table 4). When comparing the internal frequencies of Table 4, we see that all but two respondents for which data were available indicated that the general occupational character of their southern community was manual. The relationship between familial status and beliefs about relations between blacks and whites remained unrefined when the occupational character of the community respondents departed was controlled.

Table 4 Perceptions of General Relations Between Blacks and Whites in the South and Familial Status by How People Make a Living (occupational status of the community), Black Migrants to Chicago, 1915 - 1950, N = 108

(% in Parentheses)

| Relations between Blacks and Whites in community | Familial Status and How People Made a Living (occupational character of the community) | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Lower | | | Middle | | | Upper | | |
| | Manual | Non-manual | Not avail | Manual | Non-manual | Not avail | Manual | Non-manual | Not avail |
| | | (n=88) | | | (n=12) | | | (n=8) | |
| Poor to Very poor | 45 (51) | 1 (1) | 3 (3) | 6 (50) | -- | -- | 3 (38) | -- | -- |
| Tolerable | 22 (25) | -- | 1 (1) | 2 (17) | -- | -- | 1 (12) | -- | 1 (12) |
| Good sometimes to Very good | 10 (11) | 1 (1) | -- | 3 (25) | -- | -- | 2 (25) | -- | 1 (12) |
| Not available | 4 (5) | -- | 1 (1) | 1 (8) | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |

Gamma = .17 between status-level and general relations

When status level of respondents's families and general relations between blacks and white were refined by beliefs about whether the rich were black or white when growing-up (Table 5), seventy-seven percent of those of lower familial status, 49 percent of the middle, and 37 percent of those of upper familial status indicated that whites had a greater share of wealth than blacks. This can be seen by cumulating down the appropriate columns of Table 5 and making comparisons across the column. Other comparisons can be made in a similar manner.

But when the refined internal cells of the table are examined and compared, reading across the table, we see that beliefs about the quality of relations between blacks and whites vary with family status. When respondents indicated that the rich were white, 42 percent of those of lower familial status thought relationships were poor. Under this same condition, only 33 percent of respondents of middle familial status thought relationships were poor. A reversal of this pattern is seen when comparing responses across strata for those who indicated the rich were white and relations were good. Those of middle-and upper status-level families had a greater tendency than those of lower status-level families to report good relations between blacks and whites. But also, under conditions of neither or both racial groups were believed to be rich, in general, there was a greater tendency of respondents of upper familial status families to indicate relations were poor or tolerable than respondents of families of the middle-and lower -status-levels. Yet we caution that the relatively low cell frequencies make these interpretations only suggestive at best (see Table 5).

Table 6 considered the question of whether the personal values and concerns of migrants were linked to what they believed they were taught during their formative years. Responses to questions 2 (important things in life taught by parents or in school) and 3 (things considered important in life were specified by familial status. The analysis was designed to reveal the influence of early socialization on the basic values and concerns of our respondents.

Table 5 Perceptions of General Relations Between Blacks and Whites in the South and Familial Status by Whether the Rich were Black or White (distribution of wealth across racial groups), Black Migrants to Chicago, 1915 - 1950, N = 108

(% in Parentheses)

| Relations between Blacks and Whites in community | Familial Status and Whether Rich were Black or White (distribution of wealth across racial groups) | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Lower | | | | Middle | | | | Upper | | | |
| | Black | White | Both or neither | Not avail | Black | White | Both or neither | Not avail | Black | White | Both or neither | Not avail |
| | (n=88) | | | | (n=12) | | | | (n=8) | | | |
| Poor to Very Poor | 3 (3) | 37 (42) | 4 (5) | 5 (6) | 1 (8) | 4 (33) | -- | 1 (8) | -- | -- | 3 (38) | -- |
| Tolerable | 1 (1) | 19 (22) | 2 (2) | 1 (1) | -- | 1 (8) | 1 (8) | -- | -- | 1 (12) | 1 (12) | -- |
| Good sometimes to Very good | -- | 9 (10) | 1 (1) | 1 (1) | -- | 1 (8) | 2 (17) | -- | 1 (12) | 2 (25) | -- | -- |
| Not available | -- | 3 (3) | -- | 2 (2) | -- | -- | -- | 1 (8) | -- | -- | -- | -- |

Table 6 Beliefs About Values and Concerns Taught by Family and School and Familial Status by Personal Values and Concerns

(% in Parentheses)

| Personal values and concerns | Familial Status and Important Things Taught by Family or School: Lower — Self and family | Lower — Others | Lower — Not avail | Middle — Self and family | Middle — Others | Middle — Not avail | Upper — Self and family | Upper — Others | Upper — Not avail |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | (n=88) | | | (n=12) | | | (n=8) | |
| **Self & Family** | | | | | | | | | |
| Achievement/ success | 2 (2) | -- | 1 (1) | -- | 1 (8) | -- | 1 (8) | -- | -- |
| Honesty | 4 (4) | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Stay out trouble | 1 (1) | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Education/ training | 9 (10) | 1 (1) | -- | 2 (17) | -- | -- | 1 (12) | -- | -- |
| Good life | 7 (8) | 2 (2) | -- | 1 (8) | -- | -- | -- | 1 (12) | -- |
| Health | 4 (4) | 1 (1) | -- | 2 (17) | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| **Others** | | | | | | | | | |
| Helping others | 1 (1) | 4 (4) | -- | 1 (8) | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Belief in God | 4 (4) | 2 (2) | 3 (3) | 2 (17) | -- | -- | -- | 1 (12) | -- |
| Group interests | -- | 2 (2) | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Not avail | 6 (7) | -- | 34 (39) | -- | -- | 3 (25) | 1 (12) | -- | 3 (38) |

Forty-two percent of migrants of middle familial status indicated personal values and concern pertaining to self and family consistent with what they believed they were taught. This compares with 29 percent of migrants of lower familial status who reported such consistency. But also, 67 percent of migrants of middle familial

status and only two (approximately 25%) of migrants of upper familial status who reported that the important things taught by parents or in school were self and family directed while only a little better than one-third of migrants of lower and upper familial statuses held similar beliefs. This can be seen by cumulating down the appropriate columns of Table 6 and making comparisons across columns.

The responses to statements which reviewed the life situations of migrants while in the South indicate some differences in beliefs about general social opportunities in that milieu. Migrants of lower familial status were slightly more likely to indicate that relationships between blacks and whites in the South were not good. Since most migrants indicated the manual occupations were the most predominant mode of earning a living in the South, it could not be determined whether the occupational character of the community would have any systematic impact on beliefs about relationships between blacks and whites. As would be expected, migrants of lower familial status were more likely to report that the distribution of wealth in their communities disproportionately favored whites. The general tendency was for migrants of upper familial status to report that relations between blacks and whites were tolerable or good and those of lower familial status to report that relations were tolerable or poor, irrespective of the distribution of wealth across racial lines. The personal concerns and values of migrants of middle familial status were much more inward directed (self and family) and consistent with what they believed was taught during their formative years than those of migrants of lower and upper familial statuses.

On the whole, the data examined so far, though not overly impressive, suggest that migrants held different sentiments about the general opportunity structure of the South. Morever, these sentiments differ to some extent by familial status-level of respondents. According to our first hypothesis migrants' perceptions of the opportunity structure of Chicago would be influenced by sentiments associated with status-levels as well. When reviewing their premigration existences,

migrants were asked to freely respond to a general question (question 6):

What were the reasons you or your parents/grandparents left the South?

The pattern of responses to this question was expected to reveal whether migrants believed their life situations could be significantly altered in Chicago and identify matters believed to be of great saliency in their lives. Table 7 reports the extent to which specific interests were articulated by migrants of different status-levels.

Table 7 Reasons for Leaving the South by Familial Status, Black Migrants to Chicago, 1915 - 1950

(% in Parentheses)

| Premigration focal concerns | Familial Status | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Lower | Middle | Upper |
| | (n=88) | (n=12) | (n=8) |
| Personal Self and Family | | | |
| Health, safety and well-being | 3 (3) | -- | -- |
| Freedom of social action | 6 (7) | -- | -- |
| Fairness in the distribution system | 3 (3) | 1 (8) | -- |
| Education | 3 (3) | -- | 1 (12) |
| Economically Centered | | | |
| Work and wages | 27 (31) | 2 (17) | 1 (12) |
| Economic domination and better life | 31 (35) | 4 (33) | 1 (12) |
| Other | 10 (11) | 5 (42) | 4 (50) |
| Not Available | 5 (6) | -- | 1 (12) |

The effect of sentiments associated with familial status is still operative when migrants reviewed their premigration existence and cited their reasons for leaving the South. However, the data presented in Table 7 only partially confirm our reasoning about the focal concerns of migrants of different status-levels.

While income and economic deprivation seemed important to members of all status-levels, it appeared to be of greater saliency in the lives of migrants of lower status-level families than with the upper and middle levels. Two-thirds of migrants in the lower status-level, 50% in the middle status-level, and only 24% in the upper status-level paid close mental attention to this matter in their responses. This turns out to be in the direction we expected (see Table 7).

A somewhat unexpected pattern of premigration concerns is seen when respondents expressed their general feelings about physical safety and well-being, social freedom, education, and fairness in the distribution of social rewards (see Table 7). Concerns about these matters were expressed more often by respondents of lower familial status than those of middle and upper familial statuses. The absence of sufficient variation across comparison groups makes these data difficult to interpret. It may be that those of the lower status were less able to remain free of the negative impacts of dominant group intolerance in everyday situations. The regularity of contact may have increased the potential of interpersonal - intergroup conflicts, heightened awareness of unequal opportunities to pursue life goals and receive a fair share of social rewards, and encouraged feelings that education and training may be effectively utilized to improve their life situations.

There are differences among our respondents with regard to premigration concerns other than those listed for analysis. While the reasons are various, the pattern of these reasons in the data may reflect underlying dimensions of stratification. The proportion mentioning "other" premigration concerns appears much higher for respondents of the middle and upper familial statuses (see the second to the bottom row of Table 7). It is possible that the observed differences reflect uncontrolled systematic variation in beliefs about the general quality of respondents' lives in the South. To examine this, categories of premigration concerns (Table 7) were collapsed into three classifications, i.e., personal concerns for self and family, economic concerns for self and family, and other reasons.

The relationship between premigration concerns and familial status was then refined and reassessed for homogeneous categories of respondents' beliefs about the general relations between blacks and whites in the South, i.e., poor, tolerable, or good.

Table 8 Reasons for Leaving the South by Familial Status, Black Migrants to Chicago, 1915 - 1950: Respondents Perceiving Poor Relations Between Blacks and Whites in the South

(% in Parentheses)

| Premigration concerns | Familial Status: Lower | Middle | Upper |
|---|---|---|---|
| Personal self and family | 10 (11) | 1 (8) | 1 (12) |
| Economically centered | 32 (36) | 3 (25) | 1 (12) |
| Other matters | 5 (6) | 2 (17) | -- |

Table 9 Reasons for Leaving the South by Familial Status, Black Migrants to Chicago, 1915 - 1950: Respondents Perceiving Tolerable Relations Between Blacks and Whites in the South

(% in Parentheses)

| Premigration concerns | Familial Status: Lower | Middle | Upper |
|---|---|---|---|
| Personal self and family | 3 (3) | -- | -- |
| Economically centered | 15 (17) | 1 (8) | -- |
| Other matters | 4 (4) | 1 (8) | 2 (25) |

Table 10 Reasons for Leaving the South by Familial Status, Black Migrants to Chicago, 1915 - 1950: Respondents Perceiving Good Relations Between Blacks and Whites in the South

(% in Parentheses)

| Premigration concerns | Familial Status: Lower | Middle | Upper |
|---|---|---|---|
| Personal self and family | 2 (2) | -- | -- |

Table 10 (cont.) Reasons Leaving, Familial Status, Good Relations

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Economically centered | 8 (9) | 2 (17) | 1 (12) |
| Other matters | 1 (1) | 1 (8) | 2 (25) |

As indicated in the tables, the general pattern of responses in the original relationship was not significantly modified. However, there, are indications that as beliefs about relationships between blacks and whites in the South varied across the conditions of good, tolerable, and poor the proportion of respondents who left the South increased progressively under each condition. This can be determined by an inspection of Tables 8, 9, and 10 in juxtaposition.

But also, the refinements shown in Tables 8,9, and 10, while not overly persuasive, do suggest that beliefs about the general relations between blacks and whites in the South may have an important interaction effect on the relationship between premigration concerns and familial status. The subclassified relationships tend to become more specific when beliefs about the character of relations between blacks and whites are taken into account. This would suggest that sentiments about respondents' life situations were operative, to some degree, across familial status-levels, and had some impact on premigration concerns.

Looking more closely at Table 8, it can be seen that for respondents of lower familial status, 11 percent expressed personal concerns about self and family, 36 percent expressed economically centered concerns, and 6 percent expressed concerns other than those listed for analysis. While percentages for the middle and upper familial statuses may be misleading because of low cell frequencies, the patterns are noteworthy. For respondents of middle familial status, one expressed personal self and family concerns, three expressed other concerns (percentages are 8, 25, and 17 respectively). Of the two respondents of upper familial status, one (12%) expressed personal self and family concerns and another (12%) expressed economically

centered concerns. The limitations of our data have become even more apparent in Tables 9 and 10, and have made further comparisons unfeasible. However, a cursory examination will show that no respondents of middle and upper familial status expressed personal self and family premigration concerns. But also, eleven of the original eithteen respondents who cited premigration concerns other than those for analysis (Table 7) believed relations between blacks and whites were tolerable or good (see Table 9 and 10).

The data we have examined provides suggestive evidence that perceptions of respondents' lives quality in the South related to their relative status within the total group of migrants to Chicago. Differences between respondents of lower, middle and upper familial statuses were noted in the degree of disenchantment registered against the southern social structure.

The findings show that most migrants had economically centered concerns when they left the South. Yet, sentiments underlying at economic concerns varied according to familial status of migrants and their beliefs about the character of social relations between blacks and whites in the South. In general, migrants of lower familial status had less optimism about the social structure of the South than those of middle and upper familial statuses, according to the way in which we observed this dimension.

While the evidence we have amassed is by no means substantial, the data appear to provide tangential support for our first hypothesis, i.e., perceptions of the opportunity structures of the South and North will depend upon patterns of sentiment associated with status ranks that prevailed among southern blacks.

The second hypothesis this research sought to investigate was whether focal concerns of southern migrants from different status-levels influenced the types of opportunities they desired in the opportunity structure of Chicago. To explore this possibility, respondents were asked to respond to a series of questions designed to reveal information about their emotional concerns and

circumstances surrounding their adjustments to the City of Chicago. The total pattern of responses was reviewed for each case in order to assess the essential character of individual concerns. Only the responses to one key question were utilized in the analysis. The specific question was:

What did you expect to find when you came here (Chicago)?

Our aim was to elicit, classify, and analyze information about the types of opportunities desired. When this was accomplished, it would be possible to evaluate whether these expectations were influenced by premigration focal concerns.

Table 11 Distribution of Immediate Opportunities Desired in Chicago by Familial Status, Black Migrants to Chicago, 1915 - 1950, N = 108

(% in Parentheses)

| Immediate opportunities for | Familial Status | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Lower | Middle | Upper |
| Acquisition/maintenance of life chances | 27 (31) | 4 (33) | 3 (38) |
| Economic independence and control of labor/wages | 48 (54) | 4 (33) | -- |
| Miscellaneous | 11 (12) | 4 (33) | 5 (62) |
| Not available | 2 (2) | -- | -- |

It was found, as anticipated, that there were differences among our respondents with regard to what was expected in Chicago (see Table 11). The marginal totals, not shown in the table, for the three broad categories of immediate opportunities desired reflect the extent of the differences for the total sample (N = 108). Cumulating across the table, 31 percent of respondents expected to acquire opportunities for improved life chances or at least maintenance of present life chances which did not reflect an apparent economic tie. Another 48 percent of

respondents articulated immediate desires to improve their standard of living through availing themselves to jobs and other opportunities to facilitate economic independence, while 18 percent expressed various other immediate desires.

The differences were small when comparisons were made between strata for respondents who expected to acquire immediate opportunities to improve or maintain life chances, approximately one-third in each familial status-level (see Table 11). While better than one-half of lower familial status respondents desired immediate opportunities directed at greater economic independence and control of labor and wages in Chicago, only one-third of middle familial status respondents desired such opportunities. The desire for economic independence and control of labor and wages was not articulated by any respondent of upper familial status. The data in Table 11 showed further that 62 percent of upper familial status respondents desired various other immediate opportunities in Chicago. This compares with 33 percent in the middle familial status and 12 percent in the lower familial status who articulated desires for opportunities other than those included in the analysis.

As reported in Table 11, familial status was an important referent with regard to the kinds of immediate opportunities our respondents expected to find in Chicago. It was not surprising that the most salient desires of respondents of the lower familial status were income-linked. Expectations of economic opportunity probably reflect underlying feelings of economic deprivation. Middle familial status respondents were as likely to have expected income-linked immediate opportunities in Chicago as opportunities to either preserve or improve life chances, or to fulfill a variety of other desires not mentioned in the analysis. The absence of centrality of desires observed in the data for members of this strata may reflect underlying attitudinal referents of status rank. For example, other studies have found that a dominant concern of middle-status level black southerners was "respectability" and striving to "get ahead" under stable social rules and fairness

in the distribution of social rewards. Income-linked expectations appeared to be less important to upper familial status respondents than opportunities in Chicago directed at life chances or other miscellaneous desires (see Table 11, comparisons within strata).

Our next task was to assess the influence of premigration focal concerns on immediate opportunities desired in Chicago. Contingency relationships were constructed for responses to the following questions for each strata:

What were the reasons you or your parents/grandparents left the South?

What did you expect to find when you came here (Chicago)?

The results for respondents of the lower, middle, and upper familial statuses are presented in Tables 12, 13, and 14, respectively.

Table 12 Premigration Focal Concerns by Immediate Opportunities Desired in Chicago, Black Migrants to Chicago, 1915 - 1950: Lower Familial Status Respondents (N = 88)

(% in Parentheses)

| Immediate opportunities desired in Chicago | Premigration Focal Concerns: Personal self and family | Economically centered | Other matters | Not available |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Acquisition/maintenance of life chances | 14 (16) | 12 (14) | 1 (1) | -- |
| Economic independence and control of labor/wages | -- | 46 (52) | 2 (2) | -- |
| Miscellaneous | 1 (1) | -- | 7 (8) | 3 (3) |
| Not available | -- | -- | -- | 2 (2) |

Table 13 Premigration Focal Concerns by Immediate Opportunities Desired in Chicago, Black Migrants to Chicago, 1915 - 1950: Middle Familial Status Respondents (N = 12)

(% in Parentheses)

| Immediate opportunities desired in Chicago | Premigration Focal Concerns: Personal self and family | Economically centered | Other matters |
|---|---|---|---|
| Acquisition/maintenance of life chances | 1 (8) | 3 (25) | -- |
| Economic idependence control of labor/wages | -- | 3 (25) | 1 (8) |
| Miscellaneous | -- | -- | 4 (33) |

Table 14 Premigration Focal Concerns by Immediate Opportunities Desired in Chicago, Black Migrants to Chicago, 1915 - 1950: Upper Familial Status Respondents (N = 8)

(% in Parentheses)

| Immediate opportunities desired in Chicago | Premigration Focal Concerns: Personal self and family | Economically centered | Other matters | Not available |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Acquisition/maintenance of life chances | 1 (12) | 2 (25) | -- | -- |
| Economic Independence control of labor/wages | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Miscellaneous | -- | -- | 4 (50) | 1 (12) |

Table 12 shows the interaction of premigration focal concerns with immediate opportunities desired in Chicago for respondents of lower familial status. Economically centered concerns were salient for most respondents of this stratum. Fifty-two percent evidenced consistency in economically linked premigration focal concerns and economically linked expectations of immediate opportunities in Chicago.

However, fourteen percent of this same stratum who were led by economically centered concerns during their departure from the South desired immediate opportunities in Chicago not directly linked to economic concerns. Of those who desired immediate opportunities in Chicago that were not overtly linked to economic concerns, sixteen percent had left the South for personal self and family reasons.

Turning to Table 13, we see that respondents of middle familial status desired immediate opportunities in Chicago that were generally in line with their premigration focal concerns. It is interesting to note that one-third of this stratum had premigration concerns outside of the broad categories in the analysis and desired immediate opportunities in Chicago along this same line (see Table 13). The apparent regularity between other premigration focal concerns and miscellaneous type immediate opportunities desired in Chicago holds for respondents of upper familial status as well (see Table 14)

There does appear to be congruence between premigration focal concerns and immediate opportunities desired in Chicago for our respondents. The evidence would suggest that aspirations for certain kinds of opportunities, at least in broad form, may have been tempered by socioemotional concerns extending from premigration existences of respondents. But also, there is tentative support for the notion that the influence of premigration focal concerns of opportunities desired in Chicago was operative along dimensions of familial status for our sample. Yet, the hypothesized relationship between focal concerns and desired opportunities remains unclear. A major concern was that the two questions used in the analysis generated similar responses by some respondents. Also, the relatively small number of middle and upper strata respondents made some percentages less reliable and some comparisons less meaningful.

## Conclusions

Researchers investigating black internal migration have only recently begun to look beyond the Procrustean bed of the "Push - Pull" model to understand this event. The traditional disregard of individual differences and cicumstances for purely economic motives has engendered beliefs by laymen and social scientists alike that most if not all migrants who left the South were moved by the same causal factors. Only recently has attention been given to the role of individual volition concerning the outmigration of Afro-Americans from the South.

Understanding the role of sentiment is central to any complete understanding of Afro-American outmigration from the South during the early decades of this century. While many of our findings were suggestive, they do make recognizable the importance of sentiment in understanding this event. The data we have observed and analyzed indicated that individuals had different focal concerns when leaving the South and different expectations of the opportunity structure of the City of Chicago. Our analyses indicated further that familial status and attendant attitudinal patterns seemed important dimensions of stratification in shaping the general beliefs, values and attitudes of black southerners about both the southern and northern opportunity structures.

Migrants from different strata, based on familial status rank, differed in their concerns about the South and Chicago. We found tentative support for our two hypotheses: (1) perceptions of the opportunity structures of the South and Chicago were tempered by both status among blacks and perceptions of black-white relations in the South; and (2) focal concerns of southern black migrants of different status-levels influenced the types of opportunities they desired in Chicago. We note that the limitations of our data did not permit complete confirmation of either hypothesis. However, the evidence seems sufficient for us to suggest that analysis of sentiment with regard to the migrants themselves is central to a full understanding of the movement to Chicago by large numbers of southern blacks during the period in question.

We conclude that it is important for social scientists to seek out those who actually participated in events of historical significance in order to acquire more precise interpretations of the meaning of these events. The sociohistorical method seems particularly suited for such investigations. This methodology satisfies recent concerns with the phenomenological side of individual experiences as a means of achieving greater percision of interpretation of the experiences of certain racial and ethnic groups in American society. With regard to outmigration of southern blacks, this approach encourages migrants to tell their own stories about leaving the South and circumstances surrounding their adjustments in the City of Chicago. They possess the information necessary for a complete understanding of the breadth and scope of this event. Future research into this area of Afro-American history can benefit greatly from this methodology.

This investigation covered only a limited area of black internal migration. It was exploratory and no attempt was made to generalize findings beyond the sample of respondents we observed. The study was intended to provide insights for our own research concerns as well as suggestions for future social science research in this area. National studies are need in this important area of Afro-American historiography. For example, not enough is known about how dimensions of stratification that prevailed in the South affect intergenerational mobility patterns among black southerners who migrated North. Our future research will focus on the broad circumstances surrounding the social adjustment of black migrants from the South in the City of Chicago.

References

Baron, Harold
1968 "Black Powerlessness in Chicago Postscript--1974." Pp. 381-89 in Norman R. Yetman and C. Hoy Steele (eds.), Majority and Minority: The Dynamics of Racial and Ethnic Relations (second edition). Boston:Bacon.

Bobo, Benjamin F.
1974 "Black Internal Migration: U.S. and Ghana--A Comparative Study." Center for Afro-American Studies. Los Angeles:UCLA.

Chicago Commission on Race Relations
1968 The Negro in Chicago: A Study of Race Relations and a Race Riot in 1919. New York:Arno.

Cruden, Robert
1971 "Not-So-Black Reconstruction." Pp.22-39 in Robert C. Twombly (ed.), Blacks in White America Since 1865. New York:McKay.

Davis, Allison, Burleigh Gardner and Mary Gardner
1941 Deep South. Chicago:University of Chicago.

Davis, George A. and O.Fred Donaldson
1975 Blacks in the United States: A Geographic Perspective. Boston:Houghton.

Dollard, John
1937 Caste and Class in a Southern Town. New Haven:Yale University.

Drake, St. Clair
1971 "Folkways and Classways Within the Black Ghetto." Pp. 515-522 in Robert C. Twombly (ed.), Blacks in White America Since 1865. New York:McKay.

Drake, St. Clair and Horace Cayton
1945 Black Metropolis. New York:Harcourt, Brace.

DuBois, W.E.B.
1903 The Souls of Black Folk. Chicago:McClurg.

1935 Black Reconstruction. New York:Harcourt.

Franklin, John Hope
1948 From Slavery to Freedom. New York:Knop.

Frazier, E. Franklin
1957a Black Bourgeoisie. Glencoe:Free Press.

1957b The Negro in the United States. New York:Macmillan.

Henretta, James
1979 "Social History as Lived and Written." The American Historical Review 84:1293-1322.

Hoffman, Alice M.
1974 "Reliability and Validity in Oral History." Today's Speech Winter 1974.

Johnson, Charles
1941 Growing Up in the Blackbelt. Washington, D.C.:American Council on Education.

Levine, Lawrence W.
1977 Black Culture and Black Consciousness. New York:Oxford University Press.

Lyman, Stanford M.
1972 The Black American in Sociological Thought: A Failure of Perspective. New York:Capricorn.

Mueller, John H., Karl F. Schuessler and Herbert L. Costner
1970 Statistical Reasoning in Sociology (second edition). Boston:Houghton.

Myrdal, Gunnar
1944 An American Dilemma: The Negro Problem and Modern Democracy. New York:Harper.

Palen, J. John
1981 The Urban World (second edition). New York:McGraw-Hill.

Peterson, Gene B., Laure M. Sharp and Thomas F. Drury
1977 Southern Newcomers to Northern Cities: Work and Social Adjustment in Cleveland. New York:Praeger.

Pettigrew, Thomas F.
1971 Racially Separate or Together? New York:McGraw-Hill.

Pinkney, Alphonoso
1975 Black Americans (second edition). Englewood Cliffs:Prentice-Hall.

Powdermaker, Hortense
1939 After Freedom. New York:Viking.

Rich, Spencer
1982 "Blacks Progress--Slowly--in 20 Years." Chicago:Sun-Times December 14.

Smith, A. Wade
1981 "Racial Tolerance as a Function of Group Position." American Sociological Review 46:558-73.

Spear, Allan H.
1971 "From the South to the South Side." Pp. 173-84 in Robert C. Twombly (ed.) Blacks in White America Since 1865. New York:McKay.

Stearns, Peter N.
1980 "Toward a Wider Vision: Trends in Social History." Pp. 205-30 in Michael Kammen (ed.) The Past Before Us: Contemporary Historical Writing in the United States. Ithaca:Cornell University.

Wilson, Alan B.
1959 "Residential Segregation of Social Classes and Aspirations of High School Boys." American Sociological Review 24:836-45.

Economic Unit of U.S. News and World Report
1981 "Tale of America's Shrinking Cities." U.S. News and World Report March 23:66.

U.S. Bureau of the Census
1980 Characteristics of Population. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.